UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
Associate Editors

Wearing Einstein 2% Buttons

By SYDNEY STRONG

A Reasoned Remedy

By GEORGE H. SHOAF

Religion and Nature

By HERBERT A. STURGES

Thoughts of Tolstoy

PART XXIV

VOLUME CVII NUMBER 9

Chicago, April 27, 1931

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly *Subscription $3.00*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 10, 1930, at the Post office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
EDITH LLOYD JONES, *Managing Editor*

Associate Editors
LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA NAGELEY
MRS. EDITH LLOYD JONES
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
CHARLES E. BEALS
PERCY M. DAWSON
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
WALTER WALSH
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
ITALY—DOROTHY WALTON
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 131
Wearing Einstein 2% Buttons—SYDNEY STRONG 133
Jottings.—J. H. H. 135

ARTICLES—
John Galsworthy on War 131
A Free American Looks at India—IV—An Incident—EDWARD HOLTON JAMES 135
A Reasoned Remedy—GEORGE H. SHOAF 136
Religion and Nature—HERBERT A. STURGES 135
Thoughts of Tolstoy—Part XXIV 139
Triplets—MARIE G. HARLOW 140

TRUMPETS ON NEW HORIZONS—
On an April Day—JOE CORRIE 141
Channels—ALICE FERRIN HENSEY 141
Singing Waters—LARUE MERRILL 141
Freedom—ERIC HOWARD 141
Time to Pray—ALBERTA MCMAHON SHERWIN 141

THE STUDY TABLE—
A New Kind of Church—JAMES H. FAIRLEY 141

CORRESPONDENCE—
The Church and True Religion—JOHN T. RICKETT 142
Conferences and Peace—LYDIA G. WENTWORTH 142

THE FIELD—
Prohibition as Seen by a Foreign Visitor—WILLIAM C. ALLEN. 130
The Scandals of New York—*Alva Johnson* 144
Free Trade League Declaration of Principles 144

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Prohibition As Seen by a Foreign Visitor

The following statement was made by Frank A. Russell, an Australian barrister, not a Prohibitionist, who recently made an investigation of the working of Prohibition in the United States. This honest report, published in the *Alliance News* of England, is so different from the so-called Prohibition news that the people of Great Britain are fed upon through their newspapers, that it is worthy of being brought to the attention of the people of this country:

"If the visitor to America," says Mr. Russell, "will stay there long enough to get out of the visitor class, they begin to find what I found as soon as I had paid my tribute to courtesy and began to dig for my own facts; that is, that though wealthy people can get liquor with comparative ease, at a high price and sometimes of extremely doubtful quality, it is becoming an increasingly difficult job to keep the cellar full at a cost suitable to the purse of the average man. They will find, too, that though a certain small percentage of the general population brews a species of beer, and another small percentage allows home-grown wines to ferment, aided by peripatetic individuals who drop some form of alcohol into it, the great mass of the population is already indifferent to drink.

"Briefly put, my investigations revealed the unassailable fact that Prohibition is observed by that enormous and important mass of middle-class artisans and workmen, tradesmen and small commercial folk which is really the backbone of every country. At either end of the social scale were people who broke the law. At the top were the wealthy classes who have never yet kept any sumptuary law that clashed with inclination; at the bottom were the criminal and part-criminal class that had an ill-founded idea that breaking laws paid better than keeping them.

"I have come back to Australia," says Mr. Russell, "with my mind made up on the subject of Prohibition. It is not only a success, but a shining success. Had I, however, passed through America as an ordinary traveler, with his limited means of knowing only what he saw, I should have still believed that Prohibition was a farce."

To think that this result has been brought about in little more than a decade is, he says, under all the circumstances, "astonishing." "It may be a great exaggeration to attribute the whole of the prosperity of the United States to the abolition of drink; I think it is, but you would find it difficult to persuade bankers, manufacturers, mass producers, master builders and insurance companies that, in overwhelming measure, this was not the prime cause. Against my will, I was brought to believe that Prohibition was a splendid economic achievement, whose significance cannot be drowned by the shouting derision of the 'antis.'"

WILLIAM C. ALLEN

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

VOLUME CVII MONDAY, APRIL 27, 1931 NUMBER 9

JOHN GALSWORTHY ON WAR

To favor peace is to favor the continuance of civilization, for that is what it is coming to. With the development of airplanes, explosives and poison gases in recent years, the men, women and children of any country partaking in a future war seem doomed to creep like rats into a drainpipe. There will be no chivalry, honor or glory in a future war; no distinction of age or sex, or between the sick or healthy, will be shown. There will be no immunity for culture. There will be nothing but flying, invisible shapes, raining death and desolation.

The country that indulges in war will become a shadow of its former self and slink down into the pit of the past. This is no cry of alarm, but common sense.

Nobody today can believe, as some did before 1914, that war is beneficial. Before 1914, to believe in the need for peace was to be considered somewhat of a freak. In 1931, not to believe in the need for peace is to be the village idiot.

Address in New York, April 10, 1931

A powerful voice has added itself to UNITY'S voice in advocacy of a world peace day in commemoration of the Briand-Kellogg Treaty for the outlawry of war. Regularly since this Treaty was signed, UNITY has declared that the anniversary date, August 27th, of each year should be set aside in every country of the world for the celebration of peace as the achievement and blessing of mankind. Now comes John Galsworthy, eminent English author and humanitarian, to endorse this idea in words solemnly spoken to an American audience. In an address in New York City on April 10th last, he said:

> There should be a day consecrated to the Kellogg, or Paris, Pact, a day to be observed in every country of the world. I venture to suggest to your President, who has the cause of peace at heart, that he should press this on the governments of the world. We need to be reminded annually that we have renounced war.

It is the failure of this reminder, together with the recurring rumors of war in recent years, which has cast the Briand-Kellogg Treaty somewhat into the background of men's minds. Yet it stands today exactly as when it was written—a solemn pledge upon the part of the United States, France, Britain, even Russia, to "renounce war as an instrument of national policy." Why should this not be proclaimed by peoples everywhere as a sacred obligation binding upon governments? Why should not the day which witnessed the signing of this bond be dedicated upon the world's calendar forever as a holy day not for any one country or religion, but for all humanity? And how could Mr. Hoover better seal his devotion to the cause of peace than by himself leading in the appointment of this day? Galsworthy does well to appeal to the President. We join him in this appeal. Let no more time pass, but now, in anticipation of the coming anniversary this year, let America call upon the nations of the earth to establish forthwith this rite of universal brotherhood!

If there is anybody in this country for whom it would seem to be impossible to have any sympathy, it is old Albert B. Fall, Secretary of the Interior in President Harding's cabinet. When a man sells out his country for a price, he becomes an outlaw from the hearts of men. Yet when the news came that the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia had affirmed Fall's conviction for accepting a bribe of $100,000 from Edward L. Doheny, and had ordered him to meet his punishment of a $100,000 fine and a year in prison, we felt something more than a touch of compassion. For why this delay in the doing of justice in this case? The Harding administration is a part of ancient history, or so it seems. President Harding is long since dead, his wife as well, also old "Doc" Sawyer. One by one the notorious figures of this infamous regime in the nation's history have passed away or disappeared into oblivion. And now, at this late hour, when Fall is old and sick and broken, justice suddenly wakes up as though from a long sleep, drags this wretched sinner back into the light of day, and asks the past to live again! We agree with the New York *Evening Post* that delay of this kind is

> an aspect of the case even more shocking than Fall's guilt. If he could have been clapped into prison while he was yet a strong man and while public indignation ran high against his crime, the ends of justice would have been served. As it is now, no one particularly wants to punish a whining old man for a sin committed years ago.

Promptness of judgment is of the very essence of justice. England has learned this principle. Why cannot America do the same? Incidentally, as another element in the situation, Doheny, the bribe-giver, has gone scot free. What a story!

The fiftieth anniversary celebration of the founding of Tuskegee is an event worthy of national observance. Dr. M. Ashby Jones, minister of the Second Baptist Church of St. Louis, made it so by preaching an anniversary sermon in the Booker T. Washington Chapel which attracted the attention of the country. A statesman spoke in that sermon as well as an honest

and courageous man. Addressing himself to both whites and blacks, Dr. Jones declared that there could be no solution of the race question until "we cease to think racially and learn to think humanly." The consciousness of humanity, he continued, must "submerge every lesser consciousness of class or caste, party or church, nationality or race." Then, referring to the situation in the South, the preacher protested against the political enslavement of the Negro, but pointed out that, if the blacks have little freedom, the Southern whites have scarcely more.

> Not since 1870 have the white people of the South been free. And we shall have no freedom in the South, politically or socially, on any question so long as the shadow of the fear of the Negro hangs over our southern country.

As long as political coteries can sit in Washington, continued Dr. Jones, and count the votes of Southerners before they are even cast, "the South will continue a bonded section." The freedom of the white man, in other words, is contingent upon the freedom of the colored man. This was true in the days of slavery, and it remains still true today. No man knew this better than Booker T. Washington, who understood that his work at Tuskegee, while primarily dedicated to the Negro, was equally in the interest of his white fellow-citizen. The slave binds the master, as the criminal the sheriff to whom he is manacled. One can be free only when both are free. Tuskegee for a half-century has been doing this beneficent work of liberation. Its achievement has been fundamental, since it has gone to the economic roots of life. It has not been universal, since it has left untouched certain areas of human interest and character which must be occupied by any truly emancipated people. But in its own field this institute is as unique as its founder is immortal. We like to think of the black Washington, as the white Washington, as one of the supreme heroes of America.

It is interesting to read that the Labor Government of England is to take over all the London subway lines and operate them as public property in the public interest. At last, after years in office, the Government is to do something remotely resembling the Socialism to which it is supposed to be pledged! These London underground railways, be it noted, are the most extensive in the world. They are capitalized at enormous figures, and run by numerous competing companies strictly in the interest of private profit. But now the Labor Government, with the usual support of Liberal votes, is to take possession of these traction lines, unify them into a single system of operation, place them in charge of an official commission of five members, wipe out the capitalization figures, and run the service strictly at cost. All of which would seem to indicate that, in London at least, the business of exploiting the people in the interest of profiteers was swiftly coming to an end! Why street railways in any city, under ground or on the surface, should ever be privately owned or operated is something that we have never been able to understand. As well put Charing Cross or Broadway in private hands and charge a man for walking on the sidewalk, as to put the subways under these streets in private hands and charge a man for riding in its cars. The subway, or the surface line, or the elevated, is simply a modern mechanized highway, that is all. It is the way we travel today, as contrasted with journeying a-foot or a-horse in former days. Yet we allow private owners to monopolize the control of these types of transportation, and thereby tax every traveler for their own particular gain. Highway robbery was never more legitimate, and scarcely more respectable. Of course, when we become civilized, this thing will end. It is to the credit of England and the Laborites that they are already showing the way. Let New York and Chicago, and America generally, follow on!

The old idealists used to say that Truth, Goodness and Beauty went together as the divine trinity of the ideal life. Of these three only Truth seems to be left in our day, thanks to the devotion of science to reality and the fascination which science is exercising upon the modern mind. Truth as a standard is a comparatively recent thing, but now it is understood and accepted to a degree that makes any infidelity unpardonable. The church in this age, for example, is suffering from nothing quite so much as the suspicion that it persists in clinging to tradition and therewith sacrificing Truth. But if Truth is thus "mighty and shall prevail," the same can hardly be said of Goodness and Beauty. The former of these two ideals has become today a theme not for reverence but for ribaldry. Kingsley's famous line, "Be good, sweet maid, and let who will be clever," has been altogether transformed into the idea that we must now be "clever," no matter at what cost to Goodness. Virtue, in other words, has no market value any longer. To be good is to be set down at once as a simpleton, an ignoramus, worst of all, a mid-Victorian. As for Beauty, where has it flown? A new opera, produced in Philadelphia, is one vast chaos of yells, screams, discords, dissonances which rend the ear and make night hideous. The latest poetry has a raw crudity of form which makes Walt Whitman's roughest lines to seem as lovely as John Keats. Epstein's latest sculpture, "Genesis," is a thing so ugly that it surpasses the monstrous imaginings of lunacy. The new radio center, projected by Rockefeller in New York, has buildings that make even a jumbled pile of packing cases look beautiful. Beauty, like Goodness, has become a jest. Yet it is not Beauty and Goodness that suffer. Only ourselves, as the victims of the degeneracy of the times, pay the price in the end. For we, and all the horrors we conceive, will pass. But Truth, Goodness and Beauty will endure forever.

The recent death of George W. Chadwick brings to mind the fact that America has produced some fine musical composers in its day. One would never know the fact from any study of current symphony or concert programs in this country. Amid the clamorous din created by the modernist composers of France and Germany and Russia—men of "sound and fury signifying nothing"—one is tempted to wish that one might hear, as a poultice to the ear, if nothing more, some of the lovely music written by Americans during the last two generations. Horatio Parker, Arthur Foote, Edward McDowell, Mrs. Beach, John Knowles Paine, Chadwick himself—these are all but forgotten. Even Griffis and Converse and Copeland are passing rapidly into neglect. We have no trouble in keeping Victor Herbert alive in the movie-houses and on the radio, but our orchestras, choruses and opera companies seem utterly indifferent to the fate of the serious and gifted composers of the nation. Of course, these men were cultured, and not barbarous; they were learned in the technique of their craft, and not mere audacious neophytes; they wrote in the great tradition, and thus knew nothing of whole tones, horizontal harmonies, and jazz. All this consigns them, at the brute hands of modern days, to well-deserved oblivion. But when one thinks of Chadwick's "Melpomene" overture, Mrs. Beach's songs and symphonies, Edward McDowell's suites and pianoforte concertos, one wonders if a country which forgets or neglects such art-works is worthy of a culture. If we scorn what has been produced in the past, how can we welcome and preserve what may be produced in the future?

Wearing Einstein 2% Buttons

On the 14th of December, Dr. Albert Einstein made his celebrated address on war, before the New History Society, New York. In it he remarked that if 2% of the population asserted in time of peace their refusal to take part in war, it would be the end of war. This was repeated across the continent to Pasadena and back to New York, where on his departure an informal reception was given him by the War Resisters League in a saloon of the steamer "Deutschland." On this occasion, little 2% buttons were worn and two 2% medals presented to the Doctor and Mr. Einstein.

We propose to discuss the 2% idea, and the use of 2% buttons to dramatize it. We had a part in the suggestion of buttons at the inception, and naturally have some knowledge of objections, as well as of approval. Several thousand of the buttons are already in use, from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Some foreign lands are inquiring. At a mass meeting, held in Park Lane Hotel on Sunday, April 5th, attended by representatives of a score of young people's societies, "2%" was conspicuous on as many banners. The buttons were sold for a nickel each, and over 200 new wearers went home from the meeting. Sometime in May such banners will probably appear in a Peace demonstration in the streets of New York.

1. *The 2% Peace Idea.* It calls for a stand for (1) No Conscription, (2) Refusal to have part in war. Few peacemakers will object to this idea. The World's Peace Pact is in the same class, theoretically. Einstein's mathematical formula for peace is a mighty one, yet it may remain in the realm of philosophy, if unapplied. It implies personal commitment. Having done this, one may proceed along one of three lines. He may keep quiet about it, or, he may enroll as a member of the War Resisters League (171 W. 12th St., N. Y. C.), or the F. O. R. (Bible House, N. Y. C.)—or both. He can do no better than to unite with one of these organizations, and so come in contact and fellowship with a working body of active war resisters. He signs a brief statement and his name goes in as a supporter of the cause. The 2% button dramatizes. A third thing that he may do. He may walk the streets or enter his office or pulpit wearing a badge of declaration. This in no way contradicts, rather confirms, previous action.

2. *The Use of the 2% Button.* At the first great possibilities of utilization of the button as a simple means of dramatization were seen, a feature which has been lacking in peace movements up to the present. It could easily lend itself as a symbol of war resistance. Very few movements get far into the public favor and mentality, before some symbol makes its appearance. When the Temperance movement got under way in America, the pledge of total abstinence (signed in public meeting) and the blue ribbon put in their appearance. People showed "their colors." It was the same with the Endeavor movement—one of America's most popular movements—the land was sprinkled with C. E. badges. Undoubtedly, a fellowship was thus accelerated among young people of like mind. Early Christians had their symbol—it was the "sign of the fish." Nearly every other one, these days, wears some badge, from the scholastic "Kappa" pin to a G. A. R. button. It seems to be an accepted way of declaring one's learning or patriotism. Militarists are not slow in showing their "colors"—why need pacifists be so modest?

It is difficult to see how the Peace Movement can get far—granting freely the tremendous and necessary good coming from work for Courts, Leagues, Social reconstruction—until there is personal commitment—"total abstinence"—such as demanded by the 2% idea, and multitudes glad to testify to their stand from the Atlantic to the Pacific; and, War Resister Leagues

throughout the land. That commitment implies not less, but more activity in all realms of peace-making.

But, while this is admitted, objections have been made to the use of the 2% button. Statements indeed have come from Seattle, from Los Angeles, from Chicago, that the Button was just what they "were looking for" and stated why—and "the button 'took,' please send 100," "send a dozen, want to send them to friends in several other lands." But, others have raised objections. An old time Pacifist on the Coast wrote, that the use of the Button was too much in the line of "Braddockism, i. e., showing your buttons too much to the enemy, as did General Braddock." A prominent Friend, Philadelphia, wrote querying, "Will the people know that it is two percent conscientious objection rather than two percent beer?" Another friend, a prominent worker for the World's Court, said he had worn the button, no one had inquired except his wife, and she guessed that it stood for two percent beer.

Nevertheless, we are not particularly moved by these objections. The Friends are constitutionally retiring at the suggestion of open declaration, of symbolism, of taking a pledge, or wearing a badge. Frankly, if the crusading spirit does not get into the Peace people of the world, we see little hope for effective resistance to war. If the people of England and America had got behind the "Ponsonby Idea"—there would be disarmament today. But, so many peace-people held back, were working for removal of causes, or did not believe in getting excited about it. If a million of Americans would simply notify our President—in approved language and on gilt-edged paper—that he could not count on them, if he led into war—it would settle it as far as America is concerned. Why not do it? Let the reader answer. We call it a mistaken notion of patriotism, of religion, of psychology.

We are not enamored with a mere "button." It does dramatize a great idea for peace. Name something better. Name something that has the world's greatest scientist back of it; an idea that goes right to the root of the war-disease, by personal commitment against it. One would think that all lovers of peace would sing aloud with joy that they are Pacifists, be willing to wear twenty buttons if that will say to the listening world, "Openly against war. I have trained myself *not* to be a soldier."

But, people will take the button to "mean two percent beer." Pacifists who advertise this mistake should be on their guard lest behind it they are concealing some other objection—economic or religious—thus bringing discouragement. We have been wearing a 2% button now for a month. Probably a hundred have asked about it—ten or a dozen asking with amusement if it stood for "2% beer." Who would want a better chance to tell of Einstein Pacificism, with the other man opening the way? We have had more chances to testify for Peace during the past month, than for five previous years, and all without solicitation. The approach is made from the other side. Will not the suggestion of "beer" prove to be of the highest value in getting an audience? The "beer" man gets into the "net" before he is aware. Just try it on. Will the business men please study the psychological-approach via the 2% button? Of course, no one intended that it would work out this way. It may be said—without forcing a parallel—that the powerful company of early Christians at Pentecost—the company that moved the world—did not intend to act so as to be taken for drunken men—but that fact—that mistake—spread the news of the gospel in the city even more than their preaching. Even so may this be true about the mistake over "beer."

The 2% idea is bound to take on many shapes. For example, in a friend's office, we were handed a typed copy of the Einstein declaration. Added to it were the following words:

> If 2% of the people were 100% for peace there would be no war. If 100% of the people were 2% for peace, there would soon be no war. Each one would thus be devoting 175 hours of the year for peace. If 2% of the Federal income (now 85% devoted to war) were devoted to secretaries of peace, ambassadors of peace, there would soon be no War.

In other words, the introduction of the 2% idea will be to emphasize the power and obligation of a small (2%) minority! The use of so humble an instrument as a button may prove to be more powerful than the sword. If groups of young people take to the idea, let them not be frowned down. What a glorious sight, if there should spring up in the land, from Ocean to Ocean, two million of young men and women wearing a symbol, that declared: No conscription—no war—for us! Let the reader send in to the societies, mentioned above, for some of the 2% buttons—and send for enough for recruits.

In this war business, the forum-period has passed. War is already convicted. The time has come for *action*. Every reader should enlist. Be as ready to enthuse for peace as tens of thousands did for war, to show one's colors— to be willing gladly to speak for peace—and to do it openly, to enlist as a Peace Patriot.

The Peace movement is going through several stages, through which went the Temperance and Anti-Slavery movements. In these two, it was not until the open declaration of total abstinence in one and abolition in the other was made, that the end began to be in sight. It is not until the stand for total abstinence from war is made, and put to the front, that we may rejoice in hope of the end. A new social order? By all means! The best that man can conceive. Let nothing be left undone to bring it in. The cultivation of a rich mystic life of the spirit, out of which will flow peace like a river! By all means. In addition, there must be an arousement of all—especially the youth—who shall declare: War shall not be! We will have no part in it!

We shall pass the word on from lip to lip—and become a marching fraternity, who have resolved never to kill our brother. We shall form a powerful, witnessing 2% of the population—to put down war. It is some such movement, involving personal commitment, blossoming into action and enthusiasm, and perpetually testifying against the crime of war, that is in the mind of Einstein, and that must come to fruition—or, we are undone!

If the 2% Button dramatizes that great idea, catching the fancy, producing a rallying symbol, to help mankind to destroy war—so may it be—so may all peace lovers give it their blessing!

SYDNEY STRONG

Jottings

The passing of Mayor Thompson, of Chicago, has a value in itself which we would not have obscure its even greater value as a prophecy of the passing of Mayor Walker, of New York.

England kindly gave permission to the "Graf Zeppelin" some weeks ago to fly over Egypt and land at Cairo. Excellent! But we thought that Egypt was free. Why was not the Khedive consulted?

Julius Klein, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, has found at last the long-awaited solution of the unemployment problem. What we need, he says, is "more jobs." How simple—how divinely simple! Curious that nobody ever thought of this before. Mr. Klein's grateful chief, the President, should give him a special holiday in recognition of this inspired solution of a problem which has baffled the best brains everywhere.

Why is it that mayors have to go away so often for a rest? Mayor Walker, of New York, is on rest-cure all the time. Mayor Cermak, of Chicago, began his new administration by seeking a rest. Why not elect mayors who are not tired?

The world's capacity to amuse itself with trivialities was never more conspicuously and depressingly illustrated than by the furious discussion as to what Gandhi will wear on his forthcoming visit to London. Apparently we have never surmised that the Mahatma, like Jesus, might be minded on this high mission for his country to "take no thought, saying, What shall we eat, or, What shall we drink, or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed? But (to) seek first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness."

In the death of Kahlil Gibran, the world has lost a true prophet. Those of our readers who do not know this are asked to peruse the inspired pages of Gibran's masterpiece, "The Prophet."

J. H. H.

A Free American Looks at India

IV—An Incident

Looking at the inside of his prison (provided for him by Christians) has probably been an ugly experience for Gandhi. Looking at the outside of it was an ugly one for me. I did not see the Mahatma, but I felt him. With the exception of the walk up the hill with the young white-capped Hindu, all my experiences in Poona were ugly, and particularly the last.

Here is a true story. The Madras Mail reached Poona at two o'clock in the morning. I had been sleeping in the waiting-room of the station and wanted to get inside the train so as to go on sleeping as quickly as possible. A coolie took my luggage to a first-class saloon, the door of which was locked. I asked the guard please to unlock the door, but the door, we found, had been bolted on the inside by a passenger who like myself wanted to sleep and had gone to bed in one of the berths, there being four berths in the saloon. The other three berths, as we saw through the window, were unoccupied. The guard pounded on the door but the man inside refused to open. "Hurry up," shouted the guard, "there is a passenger here who wants to get in." Then an answer came. "I am not going to open and I don't give a damn." The accent of the voice indicated that we had to do with a member of the superior race. I had a certain sympathy with him. He felt perhaps that India was slipping out of the hands of the superior race and he proposed to hang on to the last. "If you don't open, I will make you pay for the whole compartment," menaced the guard. This made the situation worse, for a snarl came back: "I don't give a damn and you can all go to hell."

The guard was an Englishman, big and somewhat flabby. "I never had a case like this before," he said weakly. The man inside shut up like an oyster and the guard grew more and more flabby. The man inside won the battle. The door was never opened. It was a picture of India as a whole. India is a farm, a castle, belonging to the superior race. My state of mind remained pragmatic, with the happy result that my own entrainment was effected elsewhere, in a saloon to myself, next to the engine, where there was neither smoke, dust nor swearing.

The next morning the "go-to-hell" Briton left the train. He was going I know not where, but I was go-

ing to Madras. As he ate breakfast in the dining-car, I feasted my eyes on him, knowing him to be superior. We were in the station where he wanted to get off, and he wanted the train to wait till he had finished his breakfast. But since he could not eat and hold up the engineer at the same time, he submitted to having his coffee, toast and eggs carried into the waiting-room of the station. EDWARD HOLTON JAMES.

A Reasoned Remedy

Over the radio the other night a prominent Los Angeles, California, minister, rebuking the chain store and big business generally, declared "If something is not done to break the trusts the people will start an economic revolution." A writer in the Hollywood *Citizen,* an afternoon daily, denying that the chain store and other "Gargantuan strangling institutions are a natural succession of progress," says that "unless many things are straightened out soon by our politicians . . . what Sherman said about conflict will have an opportunity to be true again."

In other words, what is implied in these statements is that modern industry, with its labor-saving machinery and its elimination of waste, is unnatural, undesirable and unjust, and rather than submit to it society should forcibly or otherwise effect its destruction or put it under restraint. These statements would be silly were they not provocative. Unable to explain the disappearance of competition or account for the present plight of millions of unemployed as a result of modern industrial organization and concentration of wealth, but aware of the evils arising therefrom, the Los Angeles minister and the Hollywood writer, concededly good men and well intentioned, threaten disastrous consequences rather than reasoned remedies. They would resort to the lamp-post and the faggot in lieu of sensible procedure.

Frankly, the situation should give every thinking patriot serious concern, but it were folly to grow enraged. Now is the time for people to use their minds, not their emotions, and to look facts squarely in the face.

A hundred years ago the people of the United States got along without organized industry and modern methods of production and distribution. Relatively, there were no poor and no rich. Land was plentiful and could be had for the taking, and the people knowing no better endured the hardships of primitive existence. With untaken land gone and the population tremendously increased and congested, life today in America would be simply intolerable without modern mechanical equipment and modern ways of doing business. Witness China for example.

Competition in commerce and industry has almost been replaced with combination, and the process continues despite the enactment of laws to prevent it. It is impossible by law to compel men to wastefully compete when by combining they can make more money, do business more efficiently and render the public a greater service. Conscious organization and direction of commerce and industry on the largest possible scale are indispensable to the successful functioning of modern society.

Demanding a return to competition, the Los Angeles minister says if he could have his way he would duplicate the telephone and telegraph systems, all railway equipment and other monopolistic enterprises. What extravagance and what waste! This duplication, however, will not occur for the reason it is unscientific, absurd and financially prohibitive. Fewer and greater enterprises will integrate themselves with the social and economic order in conformity with the laws of evolution, and there will be no reversal of the process.

Commercial and industrial organizations to meet modern requirements are here and on the job. It is useless for critics to revile them or threaten them with destruction. They are the inevitable products of private ownership, unrestricted competition and individual initiative, all operating in a land rich in natural resources and committed to the doctrine of *laissez faire.* Were old conditions restored the process would be repeated and combination again would follow competition.

Here, briefly, is the situation. Commerce and industry, organized, have grown into gigantic monopolies owned by a few people and operated for the private profit of the owners. Public service is incidental to private profit. Since ownership in all ages and in all countries has meant rulership, so today, whether we like it or not, those who own the nation's industries rule the nation's life. What is the remedy?

Clearly, the people should own the great commercial and industrial organizations and operate them for the public good. Such ownership would confer real rulership; and for the first time in history it would be possible and practicable for democracy to find a dwelling place.

How shall this common ownership be attained? In the only way apparent—through the government we now have by the people voting for immediate nationalization. Coincident with this transfer of ownership should come, of course, complete democratization of government. Gradually or instantly, as the situation warrants, political government should give way to industrial democracy. The rapid realization of this objective will depend largely upon the education gained by the people as a result of their ownership of commerce and industry and responsible participation therein. Building the new society within the shell of the old sounds wonderfully alluring, but it is quite likely that capitalism will pyramid to its collapse long before the workers, under present conditions, organize at the point of production. Organization of labor should proceed, but political action will bring the quickest results.

Whatever else they may be called, objectors to this program, whether they know it or not, certainly are not patriots. They belie their respect for the flag if they are afraid to entrust their government with their property. They will gladly fight for their country on the battlefields of war; why object to working for their government in the factories, mines and fields of peace?

H. G. Wells announces that world peace will never come until the nations federate and international boundary lines are wiped out. This writer proclaims that the dream of Wells for a warless world will be but the baseless fabric of a vision until the people of all nations own and control the wealth which they create. Indeed, world federation and world peace depends upon

the abolition of private property rights the world over.

Commercial and industrial organization necessarily will go forward to the perfection of complete monopoly. The only question which concerns the people and which presses for an answer is whether or not that monopoly shall be private or public. Shall modern methods of production and exchange function for the common good through a government of and for and by the people, or shall private ownership prevail for private profit and individual greed? These problems are not soluble through processes of destructive revolution; their solution is possible only by constructive and thoughtful effort along lines of sanity and peace.

GEORGE H. SHOAF.

Religion and Nature

"Aspiration in Evolution," declares Robert Williams Gibson, "is Morality." This definition is the title of one of the key chapters in his 1923 volume entitled "The Morality of Nature." If aspiration, a human characteristic, be an attribute of nature in evolution, man is thereby included in nature, and made necessary to the morality of nature.

> It is evident (states the author), that life in evolution is forever reaching toward a higher life. . . . The rule then of upward progress is an automatic and fundamental one. It is a function of all vitality, and not the mere privilege of self-knowing, conscious virtue. Progress is inherent in the life-plasm.

Thus the author strives to avoid the reference to man and his higher consciousness of the upward striving of nature; but the fact remains that the qualities here associated with natural processes are primarily functions and virtues of human life alone.

In his "The Harvest of the Years" Luther Burbank clearly shows his appreciation of nature, but he does not fall into the error of giving her the rank and merits belonging only to mankind in his moods of peace and benevolence. In the higher life of man occurs for the first and only time in the natural process the moral principle of the worth of the individual. The noblest aspiration of the ages is expressed in this motive, to preserve, to develop, and to glorify every single man, woman, and child; to give to each and to all the highest and fullest life possible on the earth; to remove all obstacles and handicaps to the fullest and freest growth and expression of creative personality; to grant to "common" humanity the maximum of opportunity for spontaneous enjoyment and magnificent happiness. Whereas Burbank accurately sums up the case against blind nature in the statement: "In Nature . . . it is the whole group and not the individual that is important." From the point of view of progress and civilization, that condemns as inadequate, unprogressive and unaspiring the processes of prehuman and sub-human nature.

To be sure, the bulk of humanity, in its predominant moods seems to fall inside the description of the non-moral bulk of nature. Selfishness, greed, violence, intolerance, strife, bitterness, hatred, war; these are almost as universal in human history and in human society as they are in the sub-human process. Not all mankind is human in the sense of having achieved the tolerance of others and the will for the happiness of others present in the lives of some men in some of their moods. The attitudes and the behavior of human nature towards other portions of the race outside the group are frequently brutal, cruel, inhuman to an extreme degree; and almost invariably the potentiality of brutality exists in every human environment. In this respect man is seen as part of the undeveloped, unsocialized, not yet completely humanized part of nature. In this role he exemplifies the highest pitch of pitiless cruelty and violence. No earthquake, no volcano, no flood, not the most wide-spread and devastating of natural disasters can match the vindictive cruelty and destructiveness of our modern civilized warfare, which shows in the highest degree the non-concern for the welfare of the individual which Burbank names as the essential characteristic of nature.

Submission to Nature

If nature is moral and aspiring, as Mr. Gibson asserts, it would be proper and reasonable to submit to it; to conform to natural law. But if nature is non-moral, unaspiring, unconcerned with the highest values of religion and morality, the welfare and happiness of every individual, then we shall endeavor to escape from subordination to natural forces. This distinction arises for example when Patrick J. Ward, of the National Catholic Welfare Conference of Washington, D. C., declares in the *New Republic* of May 29, 1929, that

> Contraception . . . is forbidden by the natural law which is binding on all men, regardless of their religious beliefs. The laws of the State must conform to the natural law. . . . The use of contraceptives under any and all circumstances is sinful. . . .

The identification is almost explicit between the natural law and the laws of morality, religion and the state:

> In the statutes forbidding the sale and distribution of contraceptives, the civil law is reaffirming the natural law. . . . The Catholic Church will oppose the dissemination of birth-control information directly because such knowledge has the purpose of inducing practices which are a breach of the moral law.

But this identification of the natural law with the moral law is false and misleading; it cannot be accepted by those who believe in the higher tenets of religion and morality, at the point where these differ essentially from the circumstances and consequences of the operation of the blind forces of nature.

Nature vs. Nature

There is no unique natural law. Nature is self-contradictory and inconsistent. It is impossible to obey at the same time all the dictates of nature. The clearest example of the battle between divergent tendencies in nature is seen in the opposition of sexual and nutritive forces, the universal conflict in nature between love and hunger. It is impossible for both of these natural laws to be obeyed. Without the employment of artificial means to prevent conception mankind must renounce either the naturally ordained necessities of sex or the naturally decreed necessity of eating food, and finding means of shelter and self-protection. Nature is utterly careless of this dilemma. As Burbank clearly sees, nature is careless of the well-being of the individual, who inevitably breeds and

starves to death in the competition with his progeny for the necessities of life. Thus nature opposes nature and clashes with itself. Which is the natural law: breeding or feeding? It is impossible to follow both, except by the "sinful" subterfuge of artificial limitation of offspring, by painless, convenient, harmless means, increasingly known, and increasingly practiced.

The truly moral law permits of the "natural" functioning of instinctive activities, while preventing the "natural" consequences of these activities. The dilemma of "nature" against "nature" is thus solved. If one natural law is broken another is followed. In fact by acting in accordance with nature in some respects and thwarting nature in other respects, the demands of the higher morality, the requirement that the welfare of the individual shall be an objective of our religion, is manifestly conserved, as it cannot be otherwise.

Man vs. Nature

Man's higher powers all involve the use of sight in the control of the blind forces of nature, and the employment of intelligence in mastering natural agencies which left to themselves go forward with infinite waste and inefficiency. Man is the new creator, making use of the powers and forces of his environment when he finds them, bending the waterfall, the flood, the lightning to his purposes, harnessing fire, water, electricity, the wind, the waves, terrestrial and celestial mechanisms, mining the coal, obtaining the gas and oil which nature has laid away, and which she would allow to lie hidden and useless for another million years were it not for the ambitions and aspirations of man.

Man is not subject to nature. He can cooperate with any part of the natural environment in the conquest of any other part. He can utilize the voltages, the pressures, the explosive tendencies of chemistry, and the mechanical torques of physics. Man shelters himself perfectly from the wet, from the cold, from the wild stresses of the outdoor world. He protects himself from bacteria. He moves freely with high velocities over the surface of the land, on the water, and through the air. Man does not worship Nature; he makes use of her. Man does not submit helplessly to natural powers; he puts them to work for him. Man does not identify natural law with moral law; he makes and remakes his own moral laws in conformity with his higher and more adequate understanding of his needs and capacities; natural law is not law at all in the sense that it must be obeyed; but only in the sense that it can and must be used to save man from nature.

Nature and the Supernatural

Orthodox religion is full of supernaturalism. The military autocracy or business autocracy of the times is reflected in a theistic autocracy of the cosmos. Modern man's acceptance of these old myths is astonishing, revealing the endurance of dogma. How is it possible for man living in a Copernican Universe to believe in a God who is an old man of the skies? Modern Astronomy has no place for a Celestial Dwelling Place as the primitive astronomy had. The modernistic types of religion which are very gradually emerging in the modern world have perforce to get along as well as they can without the pictured ideas of Heaven and Hell and their varied habitants, which play so large a part in the philosophy of primitive and orthodox religions.

Modern knowledge of nature and its processes renders the older myths preposterous. There simply is no place in the thinking of modern civilized man for credence in the supernatural beings, powers, and places which made the world so interesting to our forefathers. The older religious literature no longer remains as a literal statement of factual relations; it cannot answer the tests of science. Judged from this point of view it is full of absurdities and impossibilities. Taken as poetry, as the philosophy of primitive men before the days of science, it remains interesting and picturesque. Sadly enough even this beauty of the older literature and philosophy is ruined for countless thousands by the vain effort to make them swallow it as literal truth.

Modern religion can only be based on modern knowledge. Our modern philosophy of religion must be in full accord with modern science. Anything else is superstition and folly. Any other kind of religion is mere cant and drivel. Of course a vast deal remains to be found out about nature and its ways. Some vestige of excuse therefore remains for obscurantism, inasmuch as our ignorance of some parts of nature remains considerable. But, on the whole, nature is understood at the present time in such a way and to such an extent as to shame the so-called believers in the myths of antiquity. To the extent that they over-value the supernatural explanations and under-value the natural they cast themselves out from the respectable company of the intelligent and well-informed. Entire institutions are manifestly guilty of this belated emphasis on the supernatural. It is a pity to see magnificent personalities like Gladstone and Bryan corrupted by pitiful folly and superstition, ignorant of the modern revelations of natural science, living in the old shadows of out-worn and preposterous myths and creeds!

The Worth of a Man

One important survival of mysticism in an age of science is the seeming belief on the part of many serious friends of man that the mere declaration of the worth of the individual produces this value. In reality the worth of the individual is not yet by any means an actuality; it is a possible achievement of the future when man will be more or less completely emancipated from thralldom to nature. Under natural law nearly every individual is born to poverty and to struggle. Poverty is a thoroughly natural circumstance. Poverty in the midst of plenty is a minor atrocity produced by a sad accident during the upward climb of man from general poverty to general prosperity.

Unmodified nature produces everything living in excess of the means for preserving life. Those species which have a high birth-rate survive and continue to spawn unintelligently, multiplying and fighting for the means of life. This makes the individual worthless; he is easily replaced by another; there is no lack of similar individuals. Man as well as other forms of life abundantly illustrates this principle. Its operation in human affairs has been described with wonderful insight by Dr. Thomas Nixon Carver in several remarkable economic essays, published under the collective title "Essays in Social Justice." The seventh essay bears the title "What is a Man Worth?" and is a clear-sighted research into this problem, yielding a lit-

tle later an answer in the fourteenth essay "The Cure for Poverty."

In what way and for what inner reason does it come about that by over-breeding man makes himself worthless? Dr. Carver's own penetrating analysis of this problem should be followed in detail by every careful student of religion and social justice. In a brief word the answer may be summarized as follows: Factors of production are rewarded in the distribution of the products in proportion to their necessity, which is the opposite of their replaceability. The gunpowder example illustrates this. There is an abundance of charcoal, but a relative scarcity of saltpeter for the production of gunpowder. More saltpeter, more gunpowder; but more charcoal, not more gunpowder. Therefore saltpeter is paid for more highly than charcoal.

In human productivity the factors are land, labor, management, and equipment, sometimes called capital. Equipment and management are relatively scarce factors. To capital and to successful managers goes a large share of the product of the joint factors, because capital and managing skill are scarce. With free multiplication land also becomes relatively scarce, and to its self-appointed owners, largely the managing class, also goes a relatively large share of the product of human activity. Simple labor, however, is abundant, easily replaceable, and thus receives a relatively small share of the product. This seems undemocratic and unjust; but to rail at the injustice of the social system and the greed of the managing class is to choose magical incantations instead of scientific method in the attempt to achieve a more generous state of affairs.

The scientific means of making man worth as much as he ought to be is clearly pointed out by Dr. Carver, and other scientific workers in the field of economics, respectful followers for the most part of one Thomas Malthus who long ago laid down the substantial ground work of scientific economics. It is simply to make man relatively scarce, to make labor in general, ordinary unskilled labor if you please, as scarce a factor in production as equipment, or land, or managing skill. This is the key to the problem of poverty.

> When any employer (says Dr. Carver), can hang out a shingle saying "men wanted" and have ten men apply for every job, . . . conditions are very easy for employers, but correspondingly hard for laborers. When any laborer can hang out a sign reading "job wanted" and have ten employers apply for his help, . . . conditions will be as easy for laborers as they were under the first named conditions for employers. So long as the former conditions prevail, the term "wage slavery," while inaccurate, will continue to convey a real meaning to the laboring man. Where the latter conditions prevail no one can use that term with a straight face. . . .
>
> By pursuing a consistent policy of reducing the supply of unskilled labor (concludes Dr. Carver), of increasing the supply of the scarcer kinds of employing talent, as well as the supplies of land and capital, we can, by progressive steps, approach as near to equality of incomes . . . as we care to. If we do not do this, the only honest reason we can give will be that we do not care for equality in the concrete, however unctuously we may preach equality in the abstract.

And, he might add, we will show, if we neglect these scientific means of bringing happiness and prosperity to all, that however much we love our fellow man, approve his worth, and desire his well-being, as abstract considerations, we wish these to occur, if at all, by metaphysical and magical means, since we neglect the natural and the scientific methods which alone can produce these results in concrete actuality.

In the light of this reasoning much even of our most modern religion and of our highest ethical valuation remains a vain pretense and an empty sham unless we support the movement to free the world from the consequences of our following too easily and too faithfully the "natural law" as laid down by Mr. Ward and his associates. Over-breeding is race-suicide. Only by curbing the natural breeding tendency can man emerge from the hard conditions general in the natural world into more favorable conditions envisaged by our modern higher religion and morality, and made possible by our intelligent use of natural forces in accordance with the revelations of modern science.

HERBERT A. STURGES.

Thoughts of Tolstoy

[*Selections from Tolstoy's "Reading for Every Day," here published for the first time in English*]

LXXX

1.

If men curse and blame—rejoice; if they praise, and approve—beware, grieve.

2.

There is not a single physical advantage,—strength, beauty, riches, rank—nor even a single good quality,—learning, education, even kindness—that is not destroyed and changed from an advantage and a good quality into a repulsive trait in the absence of humility. There is nothing more revolting than a man who takes pride in his wealth, his rank, his mind, his education, even in his kindness. Men want to be loved by others, and they know that humility attracts others, but still they cannot be humble. Why is this? Because humility cannot be acquired separately. Humility is the consequence of a man's transferring his desires from the worldly to the spiritual sphere.

3.

Success in being good is only true success when you do not notice it yourself.

4.

I must believe that God's work is His work, and that it is being done and will be done even without me; but if it be my lot to take even a small part in it, then let me count this a special happiness, but no merit of mine.

5.

To the meek and humble heart, all is easy and all is blessed. We believe and know this. But when we begin to live, we often feel that our yoke is not blessed and our burden heavy. What does this mean? One of two things: either it is untrue that for the meek and humble all is blessed and all is easy, or we are not meek and humble enough.

LXXXI

1.

We must learn without ceasing to act, speak and think the truth. Only he who begins to learn this, understands how far we still are from the truth, and how much we still have to learn.

2.

Do not think that you must speak and act the truth only in important things. You must always speak and act the truth, and never, even in the most trifling things, permit yourself to lie. It is not important whether a groat or a small evil arises from your untruth, but it is worth a great deal never to defile yourself with a lie.

3.

Reason and mind are two quite different faculties. Mind is the capacity to consider and understand the conditions of every-day, worldly life; while reason is the divine essence of the soul, which reveals to the soul its relationship to the world and to God. Reason is not one and the same thing as mind—but its opposite. Reason frees man from those snares (delusions) that the mind sets for him; and in this lies its chief activity. By destroying snares, it frees the substance of the human soul—love, and gives it the possibility of manifesting itself.

4.

People make a great mistake in using their reason to hold life in the state in which it has been and now is. Truth shows that life cannot be held in a former state, hence that it is indispensable to find new states proper to the new times.

5.

It is a joy to understand the falsehood of others and expose it, but how much greater joy to catch yourself in a falsehood and denounce yourself. Try to give yourself this pleasure as often as possible.

LXXXII

1.

Often in order to bring about what you desire, you need only cease to do what you are doing.

2.

A driver does not throw down the reins because he could not stop the horses all at once. He continues to pull, and the horses come to a halt. And the same with you and your passions: if you have failed to restrain them once, keep on struggling. You—not the passions—will conquer.

3.

Lack of self-control in one action weakens the power of self-control in another. Lack of self-control in another action calls it forth in a third. The habit of failing to control oneself is an invisible stream beneath the house, which will sooner or later wash away its foundation.

4.

If you want something so much that it seems you cannot abstain from it—do not trust yourself. It is false to say that a man *cannot* abstain from anything whatsoever. He alone cannot abstain who has assured himself in advance that it is impossible.

5.

That is a good joke of Bruloff's—that it is better not to do anything, than to do nothing. For me the meaning of this is that when a man does nothing (that is, trifles, visits, fine clothes, parades, masses, empty conversations), it is far worse than when he simply sits with folded hands, because in the first case he is very well satisfied with himself, and in the second, quite the contrary.

6.

The more difficult a situation seems, the less we should take action. By such action we usually spoil the conditions that are beginning to be shaped to our best interests.

7.

Every man in his own life is like a horse on a treadmill; whether he wants to or not, he must work. For man the only question is—on which treadmill he will stand, whether he will do worldly work or the work of the soul.

8.

As a worker knows that he serves his master's business, if he fulfils all that is ordered him, just so do you know, indubitably know, that you are doing God's business, if you recognize the truth that is revealed to you and fulfil it.

For this you need no heroic deeds, no physical efforts, but only an inner effort of consciousness: the denial of hypocrisy and the recognition of the truth. And every individual man can make this effort, because, in making it, he depends on no outer influence and is always free.

LXXXIII

1.

The felicity of men's lives is the love amongst them. Beware of violating this love by an unkind word.

2.

You can dispense with thinking over in advance what you are going to say, when you feel yourself quiet, kind and loving. But if you are unquiet and irritated, beware of sinning by a word.

3.

After a long conversation try to remember all that was said, and you will see how empty and unnecessary, and often how bad, it all was.

4.

Almost always, on seeking within ourselves, we find the same sin for which we blame another. If we do not know that particular sin for our own, we have only to look about and we shall find worse.

(To be continued)

Triplets

When Desperation wedded Hunger she bore triplets—Crime, Suicide and Insanity.

Suicide was a frail, weak girl, and she could not fight against her brother, Insanity, when he attacked her. There was nothing she could do until afterwards, and she did it, and the world said that she had been well-named.

Crime was a husky boy from the start. He had the passions of a man before he became one. He possessed more lust than greed, and sometimes he was mistaken for his brother, such was the resemblance.

Of all the evil things he did, the worst was to know his mother, Desperation, in incest. After that, Hunger fled and was seen no more. Desperation was hardly recognizable in her silks and fine laces.

The children of this union were never seen on open streets. They hid themselves away lest their uncle, Insanity, find them and claim them and shame them before their neighbors.

So decent men and women married them and carried the blood further astream. And afterwards men in high places, as well as low, felt strange yearnings in their hearts.

MARIE G. HARLOW.

Trumpets on New Horizons

On An April Day

A purple sky,
  A rainbow in the east,
  What a glorious feast
Of joy.

Hey! hey! old boy,
  Rest your plough-horse a while,
  Look up and smile
At the sky.

But he trudges on
  Battling with Time and Earth,
  Peace, hope, contentment, and mirth
All gone.

Living to toil
  That others may eat his corn,
  And lash him with scorn
The while.

JOE CORRIE*

Channels

Young rivers at high flood are always grinding
New channels for old truth's fresh crystal winding
Across the settled landscape of our thinking . . .
We start to follow——We stand blinking . . . blinking . . .

ALICE FERRIN HENSEY

Singing Waters

The blue of the sea, and the blue of the sky,
A chant as long as the cosmos high,
The sand, and the spray, and the wandering sail
Are notes in the ever-ascending scale
Of a prayer to One whose infinite power
Has fashioned the world like a luminous flower.

LAURIE MERRILL

Freedom

I never want to see again
A prison full of captured men.

Men are sad enough when free
But men held in captivity

Are like sick beasts within a cage
Who pace about and roar and rage,

And every single thing they see
Becomes an awful enemy.

Banishment were better far
Than prison wall and steel bar.

A fallen angel, sent to hell,
Knows not the horror of a cell.

ERIC HOWARD

Time to Pray

Today there is no time to write a song,
  Should nature beacon me with usual grace;
  For there are many things for me to place;
The temple must be swept and garnished long
Before the dark returns, and children throng
  Within the sanctuary—home's embrace.
  I must prepare the food and interlace
A hope with work to make the spirit strong.

The children gather home, when tasks are done,
  Like homing birds return as darkness falls;
Within their winds is locked what day has won
  That leads to freedom's wings or prison walls;
I've had no time to write a song today,
But every moment I've had time to pray.

ALBERTA MCMAHON SHERWIN

The Study Table

A New Kind of Church

This book** is the story of one of the most remarkable religious movements of our time. In the introductory essay Mr. Skinner tells briefly and graphically of the rise and growth of the Community Church of Boston. "About ten years ago," he says, "a small group of people in Boston, who had been associated in various types of social reform movements, felt the need of some spiritual and religious motivation for the task of building a new social order out of the wreck left by the World War." Under the joint leadership of Mr. Skinner and Mr. John Haynes Holmes, the movement progressed to such an extent that now the services are held in Symphony Hall, one of the largest places, and altogether the best where such services could be held, and where an audience averaging well over 1,200 gathers each Sunday morning. These audiences are composed of people of widely differing social standing, and of all shades of religious and non-religious thought and feeling.

A unique phase of the movement, and the one which gives the name to the book, is the fact that the pulpit is occupied each Sunday by a different speaker. Seventeen different speakers are listed in the book and their addresses are printed. While Mr. Holmes speaks once each month, and Mr. Skinner conducts the service every week, in the main the hearers are given a very wide range of speakers, and an equally diversified list of subjects. With the exception of Margaret Sanger, who appeared in a symposium with two men, all the speakers were men. Most of the men whose addresses are printed are ministers, but representing three religions, Hebrew, Hindu and Christian. The first two are John Dietrich, setting forth the Humanist phase of religious belief, and William Pierson Merrill, the Theistic. This circumstance alone shows the temper of the movement. These men do not debate; they speak independently, on different Sundays, leaving to their hearers the matter of choosing and judging.

Another distinctive feature of the services is the question or forum period which follows each address. A stenographic report of the questions and answers is appended to most of the addresses, which gives the reader an opportunity of assessing the effect of the speaker's remarks on his auditors. The forum period seems to have been admirably conducted so that the professional heckler, the man who always says the same thing, and airs the same hobby, *et id omne genus*, the bane of such exercises, seems to have been pretty well kept in his proper place.

While mere numbers are never a criterion, the fact that this movement, with its radical departures form the usual stereotype, has attracted and held such a large number of people, has paid its way without any

*A Scotch miner to whose book "The Road the Fiddler Went" (Forward Publishing Co., Glasgow) Ramsay MacDonald has written a preface. He is probably Great Britain's foremost labor poet.

**A Free Pulpit in Action, by Clarence R. Skinner, Editor. Published by Macmillan Co. $2.50.

trouble, and has won for itself a standing place and a reputation in a great city, constitutes a challenge to the other churches in its neighborhood, and raises the interesting question whether this new plan, in some of its phases, if not in its entirety, might not well be tried by other religious organizations. Certainly ministers and other religious leaders might read this book with profit and ponder its contents.

One of the problems faced by the Community Church group has been the conduct of the service before the address. The nub of the difficulty is the prayer. Mr. Skinner devotes considerable space to it, and the address which the editor has selected to be printed among those delivered by Mr. Holmes is entitled "Shall We Abandon Prayer?" As this matter of public prayer is one which all advanced liberals have to face it is well to have the experience of these two leaders for their profit. Mr. Skinner says: "No church can dodge the question of prayer. It must continue its present mode through conviction; it must modify its practice to harmonize with our present world; or it must eliminate prayer altogether as having no rational and defensible place in the service." Again, "It is the conviction of the editor that something analogous to prayer must be retained if there is to be a complete and effective service of worship." After some discussion of the way in which prayer may be made conformable to modern psychology until it has lost pretty much all semblance to what prayer has been in the past, the editor gives a sample prayer that has been used in the service at the Community Church. This prayer is really an exhortation to fellow worshipers, and is couched in sentences which begin "Let us Climb," "May we feel," etc. But the favorite expression is "We pray that," etc. "We pray that we shall renew our determination to follow the gleam" is one expression. Now in all candor, just what does this mean? When one prays what act is he performing? "Pray" here would seem to mean "ask." But to what or to whom is the asking addressed? If to ourselves as the assembled congregation, it is equivalent to the pious wish that our boot straps may hold while they lift us to something. If one has to assume that no "effective service of worship" can be had without this form of prayer, he is indeed in dire straits. In the Community Church in White Plains we have cut the knot and have eliminated prayer. If one is used we frankly take such a noble expression as that of Martineau's "O God, before whose face the generations rise and pass away," etc.

Mr. Holmes meets the issue in a different way. He says the language of prayer is the language of poetry, and likens the address to the Deity to the apostrophes which the poets address to this or that object or phenomenon in nature. He also assumes, or so it seems to one reader, that if the audience do not like the prayer, and other parts of the service, they ought to, and the service must be made to conform to certain criteria determined upon by the leader, or leaders, and not by the auditors themselves. This as also Mr. Skinner's assumption that there can be no effective religious worship without prayer may both be challenged as didactic and dogmatic. Mr. Holmes well says that our hymns and prayers both need to be rewritten. Either that, and radically, too, or until something dignified and rational is forthcoming, utilize the classics and believe that "effective religious worship" has taken all sorts of expression from the high mass of the Roman Church to the silence of the Friends, who say, "The basis of our worship is silence." As for prayer let us be brave enough and honest enough to face the fact that these hortatory and poetic "aspirations" are only weak substitutes for such noble expressions as "Lord, thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations."

But this matter of the service is one which the leaders and the members of the Boston Church will work out successfully. They have inaugurated a movement which may well serve as a pioneer which other churches will follow. They do well to give in this volume an account of their labors, and in the printed addresses, too many and varied for comment here, a sample of the high and earnest spirit which is there manifested.

JAMES H. FAIRLEY.

Correspondence

The Church and True Religion

Editor of UNITY:

A great deal is being said these days about the waning influence of the church. A great many reasons are given, but most if not all are symptoms of the disease not the cause. We will have to look deeper than materialism for the trouble. Dr. Phelps of the Michigan *Christian Advocate* said a few years ago, "There is an infection in the church somewhere," but failed to find it.

The foremost question in the world today is, "What is God like?" It underlies every other question. Rufus Jones said, "There is only one way out. The discovery of God. The mission of the present age is to discover God." Dr. Temple, Archbishop of York, England, said, "The more you believe in a false god the worse it is for you. Everything depends upon the thought you have of God; the real battle ground of human thought lies here."

There are but few individuals in the world that believe in the God of Jesus. Gandhi and Kagawa are outstanding examples and Gandhi does not even call himself a Christian.

Dr. E. T. Tuttle says, "the churches are more interested in prosperity than any other thing." Our minister prays for prosperity every Sunday. What does prosperity mean? More millionaires and more paupers, more full granaries and more empty stomachs, more cotton and wool and more nakedness. If the churches believed in the God of Jesus could they pray for prosperity? If Jesus was here would he utter such a prayer? I think not. God has done his part. If mankind would only do their part.

If we wish further evidence of the unbelief of the churches in the God of Jesus, and also to see their impotence we have only to read an article in the *Christian Century* of February 4th by C. T. Holman on the "Bread Line at Worship." He describes the crowd of unemployed that the Immanuel Baptist Church of Chicago is feeding, from 1,500 to 1,700 men and boys, and 300 to 400 women and children daily, and when we read we cannot help but admire the spirit which prompts it. But it is not charity that humanity needs, it is justice. Charity at best is a smoke screen that hides the real issue.

Then he describes the preaching service on the last Sunday of 1930, and he was the preacher. "The galleries were full . . . every seat was taken by the unemployed. . . . It was a hard crowd to preach to. . . . A Happy New Year. What mockery, everything I could think of seemed to taunt their misery. . . . I spent the time. . . . It did not have the ring of reality. . . I was not supposed to preach to the galleries but to the paying customers downstairs I tried to, it didn't go, it fell flat. No wonder—. Could anyone conceive of a better opportunity for Christ's message? and nothing to say. The result of our social system in

two groups in the same building. Imagine Christ standing there and no message. 'He that hath this world's goods and seeth his brother suffer need how dwelleth the love of God in him.' 'He that saith he loveth God and hateth his brother is a liar.' 'A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another as I have loved you.' 'By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, that ye have love one for another.' No message. Then he asks the question, 'Is this the best that Christianity can do in the presence of human need?' and then says 'It is the entrenched selfishness of vested interests which stand as a massive barrier to progress.' And the church is tied hand and foot to this same social system."

Is it any wonder we are leaving the church? No message, only charity here and a hell hereafter unless we subscribe to certain unbelievable dogmas. But we are not giving up the great quest of humanity. We are seeking for a better God, a God "who has the power to help in the struggle for existence and who can inspire and raise us to the highest level of a triumphant life." "All conceptions of God which make of him the ultimate reality, or the ruler of the universe, while neglecting to make him immediately accessible to human need, will fail to interest the human mind for long."

Studdert Kennedy said, "If the church of the twentieth century does not repent. . . . If she still allows her members to be dishonest and to comfort their consciences by pampering the poor with doles of easy charity, if she is content with merely individualistic Christianity, she will discover that neither doctrinal orthodoxy nor ecclesiastical correctness can save her from the doom which God pronounced upon all rotten institutions.

JOHN T. RICKETT

Howell, Mich.

Conferences and Peace!

Editor of UNITY:

In your issue of March 30 were two outstanding contributions to the realm of education of public opinion that deserve particular attention. The first was the editorial on the conference of Progressives which closes with the words: "Personally we are getting tired of little select groups of the intelligentsia getting together to formulate their own abstract and sterile ideas, and then going home as though a piece of work were done. When are we going to mingle with the folks, meet the people where they are, and seek in their own ranks the leadership they need?" Is it not the Editor-in-Chief who deserves thanks for that? It reads like him—like his justifiable impatience with an exhibition of stupidity where intelligence should be expected.

Not that I wish to imply stupidity on the part of the conference. Far from it. But, as the editorial suggests, conferences so frequently seem to fall short of what should be an important objective, namely, the education of public opinion. And, judging from the general situation today, unless the masses are reached so that an enlightened public opinion can become articulate we shall continue to muddle along as now—and get nowhere unless into deeper trouble. If the average citizen realized that the World War was partly, if not largely, responsible for the present widespread depression and unemployment, would there not be more general conviction and demonstration against that curse of mankind—war?

The second contribution was the brief but impressive article on "Military Training" by Rev. Arthur L. Weatherly. I wish that might be read to every high school and college student in the country. The words: "we must teach the children of this and coming generations that of all the lies ever concocted by the Prince of Liars, the most cruel and wicked is that war is inevitable," ought to be engraved in letters of gold and hung in every schoolroom in the land—and in every land, written in each country's native tongue.

The time has come—the hour has struck—when the people, the masses, must speak if the world is to be saved from devastation and ruin by another war. Since it seems only too apparent that governments will not take the initiative in cutting down armaments, the people must make their demands imperative. Every little while some noted person speaks publicly or writes about the force of "public opinion," commenting on its enormous possibility of accomplishment. The latest pronouncement that I have read is that of Arthur Henderson who has said that the figures which governments will insert into the framework of disarmament drawn up by the Preparatory Disarmament Commission "will depend upon public opinion."

Sometimes I wonder if public opinion is really as powerful as it is said to be and is as strongly opposed to war as so frequently stated. Do people as a whole dread and fear war—in this country at any rate? Or is it just plain ignorance of the need for vigorous expression of his opinion that keeps the average citizen from making himself heard?

However that may be, the immediate problem for citizens of the United States is what can be done—collectively and individually—to make the disarmament conference in Geneva next February a success. To quote Arthur Henderson more fully: "Europe today, is as full of difficult political problems as it was five years ago, and I say as the Foreign Minister of a Great European Power that it is in disarmament that the key to the peaceful solutions of these problems can be found. . . . On all grounds we believe the case for the policy of disarmament to be overwhelming. It is on moral, economic, political and material grounds that I hope your appeal to the peoples will be made. . . . I hope you will show the governments that however far they may be ready to go, their peoples will be behind them." This was in a speech at a huge mass meeting for World Disarmament held in the Queen's Hall, London, under the auspices of the W. I. L. P. F., British Section. In another part of the same address the speaker said: "Disarmament in the sense I have indicated has now become a matter of practical politics. Everything now depends upon how the Governments complete the framework which the Preparatory Disarmament Commission has drawn up and upon the figures which the Governments insert. The vital question for every friend of peace is therefore this: 'What will these figures be?' . . . What the figures will be will depend upon public opinion. At the Disarmament Conference as elsewhere, and I say this as an old politcal hand, the Governments will do what the people want. If the people want disarmament, they can have it."

At this same meeting Camille Drevet spoke for France and as the International Secretary of the W. I. L. P. F.; and representative of the League from different countries reported on the number of signatures thus far secured to the World Disarmament petition. The English people are certainly taking the petition seriously for more than a quarter of a million have signed besides 50,000 in Northern Wales, the result of a house-to-house canvass. In the United States the paltry pitiful record is 12,000 according to the latest estimate, though it is only fair to say that this section has not yet concentrated on an intensive drive.

No nation will wield more effective influence at the World Disarmament Conference than the United States whose attitude will largely determine the success or failure of that conference. Upon its decision will rest the fate of millions. What pressure can our people exert to force our government to stand for a positive reduction in armaments, say, 10 percent annually, or some such figure? What can every peace-minded person do to rouse the average indifferent citizen to action? The presentation of the W. I. L. petition to the conference by twenty-six or more of the most prominent nations is one way by which public opinion can declare itself. If there is any reader of UNITY who has not sent for a copy of this petition, will he or she please do so at once and get signatures to fill the blank spaces. One million signatures should be the *least number* from this country; and I know from personal experience that securing signatures is not difficult. If one refuses to sign, say you are sorry for him or her and pass to the next person. But get busy. Do what you can to make a success of the 1932 Disarmament Conference, for, if that should fail, the outlook is too terrible to contemplate.

It would mean building of bombing planes for the indiscriminate slaughter of millions of innocent unprotected civilians. It would mean increase in our $1,000,000,000 program of naval vessels. It would mean dishonoring the Pact of Paris to which we and fifty-six other ntaions have pledged faith. If governments are indeed amenable to public opinion, let every peace-minded person make a solemn pledge to work as never before that the Geneva Disarmament Conference shall realize fully the desire for peace in the hearts of the common people and shall act in accordance with that desire.

LYDIA G. WENTWORTH

Brookline, Massachusetts

The Field

The Scandals of New York

New York is colossal, astonishing, fascinating. Ibanez said that the sight of its buildings made him proud that he was a member of the human race. Paul Morand, a connoisseur of cities, finds New York the most charming spot on earth. But, politically, New York is a failure. As a muncipality it is corrupt, incompetent and sluttish to the last degree. New York is:

The city that disposes of its garbage by dumping it into the ocean, where any prolonged south wind blows it back to cover New York and New Jersey beaches with vegetables, bottles, domestic animals and insecticide tins.

The city that transports the bulk of its population in accommodations that Armour and Swift would not offer to their swine.

The city that, in order to protect the bathers on its beaches, employed life guards—fifteen of whom did not know how to swim.

The city that spent $40,000,000 to construct inaccessible piers never visited by ships.

The city which for years allowed a group of crooked policemen, lawyers and prosecuting officers to jail innocent girls, unless ransomed for $500 each; the city in which a woman fifty-three years old, leading a quiet life, was perjured into jail for not paying blackmail to the police vice squad.

The city where distinguished citizens, organizing to combat immorality, formed the Committee of Fourteen and issued reports fervently praising the work of a deputy prosecutor, who now confesses that he accepted six hundred bribes to help the police frame six hundred women.

The city in which bribery is a stepping-stone to the judiciary; the city in which a police detective has been demoted on the ground that he disgraced the Police Department by associating with the friends of a judge; the city which chuckles at the musical comedy line, "We have the best judges that money can buy"; the city in which a decent private citizen on being hailed as "Judge" whirled round and snarled, "When you call me that, *smile*."

The city which, having the finest architects and city planners at command, allows its map to be altered at the instance of a horse-doctor.

The city which, although free from smoky industries and blessed by nature with a clear atmosphere, has succeeded, by sheer slackness, in making itself one of the murkiest and grimiest cities on the continent.

The city which, having potentially one of the finest police departments, has trained it so poorly that nearly all forms of detective work requiring brains have been forced into the hands of private agencies.

The city which deliberately educates its masses to a boorishness unknown elsewhere. By failing to provide transit facilities that would be adequate for a city half its size, New York compels its masses to fight their way into the subway trains at the rush hours; it teaches that the standard mode of pedestrianism is to drive one's head into the small of the next man's back and plunge forward. New York exacts homicidally bad manners of its inhabitants. To give one example out of many, a mob trained in the subway school of deportment lowered its head at a baseball game at the Yankee Stadium and made a rush for shelter from a shower, trampling two persons to death and butting scores over the side of a wall. The crowd had no bad intentions. It had been drilled by a backward municipality to suppose that the charge of a wild boar was the conventional mode of progression.

New York is the city which arrested two hundred persons last summer for sitting on their own camp stools on a public beach, the offense being that of wilful failure to patronize a politician who had seats to rent.

New York is the city which refuses to waive immunity, the city which declines to testify on the ground that it would incriminate itself. Not that an isolated officeholder or political leader refuses to be questioned, but that many of the responsible chiefs of the city government, instead of aiding whatever investigations are going on, decline to sign the waivers of immunity which are handed them when they are called before the grand jury. Leader John F. Curry, the head of Tammany Hall and the real head of New York City, runs out, tears streaming down his cheeks, and says that the request to sign a waiver is an insult; twenty-three Tammany district leaders follow his example, refusing to waive immunity. Nearly every one of the twenty-three is a department head or assistant department head of the New York City government. For all governmental purposes they are New York. It is the city itself which brands itself as refusing to run the risk of prosecution.

Alva Johnston in *Harper's Magazine*

Free Trade League

Declaration of Principles

The Free Trade League, continuing the work of the League organized in 1866 by William Cullen Bryant, David A. Wells and others, as reorganized under the presidency of the late George Haven Putnam, is founded on and upholds the principles following:

1. Freedom of trade is an essential factor in securing and maintaining the peace of the world.

2. The peoples of the world are entitled to obtain, free from any needless charges or burdens, the materials of production required for their livelihood and their work.

3. The devastations of the war and the depressions that have followed have made it more evident that the imposition of tariff charges upon food, clothing and equipment for the millions of people who have suffered therefrom is little short of a crime. It is equally true at all times that to increase the cost of the means of livelihood to peoples in need is likewise, if not a crime, at least an economic blunder.

4. The first step toward freedom of trade should provide for the removal of the duties on the food of the people and the materials of industry, the simplification of administrative methods and the repeal of the obsolete navigation laws.

5. The claim that tariffs assist industry and foster production proves delusive in the long run, for on the contrary, tariff taxes constitute a burden on productive industry and, by reducing available markets, lessen the demand for labor and capital.

.6 Trade being essentially an exchange of goods, to buy we must sell and to sell we must buy; thus imports and exports involve each other and the prohibition or discouragement of purchases from other nations prevents export of our products, thus forcing labor from natural channels, through which production and trade are increased, into artificial channels which misdirect production and are wasteful of labor.

7. Lower wage scales and lower standards of living in other countries do not justify high tariffs for the United States; experience has shown that labor efficiency is promoted and labor cost reduced by the higher wage scale and higher standard of living which are the bases of the most successful American industries.

8. Freedom of trade between countries gives the best assurance of peace on earth and good will among nations. The economic peace and political security thus assured will prove the best safeguard for the permanency of a League of Free Nations.

9. We welcome the cooperation of all who are opposed to tariff protection and to other forms of indirect taxation, which tend to favor the few at the expense of the many, to make the rich richer and the poor poorer.

10. We also invite the cooperation of all Americans who, though not prepared to favor for the United States entire freedom of trade such as that between our forty-eight states on which American prosperity has been built, are ready to join with us in working for tariff reduction in the interest of our 120,000,000 people as consumers and, by thus widening the home market, in the interest also of American producers.

Free Trade League, 2 West 45th Street, New York.

The
Oakland :: Press
GOOD PRINTING
Invitations, Announcements, Programs,
Letter Circulars, Business and Personal Stationery, etc.
3913 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.
PHONE - ATLANTIC 1876

Phone Oakland 0489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES
Everything in
HARDWARE
AT
JOHNSON'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.